

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

ANTHONY MEEKS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 19-10868

DONALD RICUMSTRICT, VICKI LEWIS,
DAVE MARTIN, and JOHN DOE,

Defendants.

**ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
ORDER DENYING MOTION TO COMPEL**

Plaintiff Anthony Meeks brings this civil rights action, arising out of his incarceration at the Gus Harrison Correctional Facility, against several Michigan Department of Corrections ("MDOC") Defendants. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff complains that his constitutional rights were violated in various ways, alleging that he was subjected to threatening, discriminatory, retaliatory, and harassing behavior as a result of his filing of a grievance against MDOC correctional and medical staff. (ECF No. 49, PageID.469.) Several Defendants and claims have already been dismissed, and a motion for summary judgment on all remaining claims is currently pending. (See ECF Nos. 16, 65.)

On April 18, 2022, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel. (ECF No. 59.) In his motion, Plaintiff maintains that Defendants have failed to respond to his discovery request that he sent on March 14, 2022, and that Defendants have failed to comply with the initial disclosure requirement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1). Defendants filed a response. (ECF No. 59.) On May 2, 2022, Magistrate Judge Altman entered an order

denying without prejudice Plaintiff's motion to compel. (ECF No. 60.) She explained that (1) Defendants demonstrated that they filed the responses to the March 14 discovery requests in a timely manner and (2) that under Rule 26(a)(1)(B)(iv), the initial disclosure requirement does not apply in cases such as this where an action is brought "without an attorney by a person in the custody of the United States, a state, or a state subdivision." (*Id.*, PageID.557-58.) Plaintiff filed an objection to Magistrate Judge Altman's order, which is now before the court. (ECF No. 61.) The court has reviewed the record and does not find a hearing to be necessary. E.D. Mich. L.R. 7.1(f)(2). The court will overrule Plaintiff's objections.

Plaintiff's objections are akin to his previously overruled objections. (See ECF No. 53.) As the court made clear in its January 19 order, the "filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirement of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object." *Cole v. Yukins*, 7 F. App'x 354, 356 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir.1995)). Here, Plaintiff provides bare objections without reasoning. His objections are challenging to understand; present vague, generalized disagreement with Magistrate Judge Altman; and otherwise discuss matters that are not fully relevant to the issues presented in the order denying his motion to compel.¹ Instead of objecting to discrete portions of the order denying his motion to compel, Plaintiff has presented what amount to recitations of his allegations or complaints pertaining to the court's previous rulings on other matters, such as the

¹ Plaintiff also has not complied with Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 5.1(a), which mandates that all papers submitted to the court must be double-spaced. To the extent Plaintiff plans to continue filing handwritten documents, he should take care to comply with the local rules by including more space between each line of his paragraphs.

appointment of counsel. Plaintiff has effectively failed to properly object to any of the magistrate judge's central findings.

In short, Magistrate Judge Altman's order demonstrates that she fully reviewed the arguments presented by the parties and came to the correct legal conclusion. Plaintiff, however, has presented only "vague, general, or conclusory" assertions that do not amount to proper objections. See *Cole*, 7 F. App'x at 356. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Objections (ECF No. 61) to Magistrate Judge Altman's "Order Denying Without Prejudice Plaintiff's Motion to Compel" are OVERRULED.

s/Robert H. Cleland
ROBERT H. CLELAND
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: July 25, 2022

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, July 25, 2022, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Lisa G. Wagner
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk
(810) 292-6522

S:\Cleland\Cleland\JUDGE'S DESK\C2 ORDERS\19-10868.MEEKS.OVERRULINGOBJECTIONS.MAZ.docx